



# City of Annapolis

Department of Planning & Zoning  
145 Gorman Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Annapolis, MD 21401-2535

[PlanZone@annapolis.gov](mailto:PlanZone@annapolis.gov) • 410-260-2200 • Fax 410-263-9158 • TDD use MD Relay or 711 • [www.annapolis.gov](http://www.annapolis.gov)

## Historic Preservation Commission VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING July 22, 2021

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) of the City of Annapolis held its regularly scheduled public hearing as a virtual meeting on July 22, 2021. **Chair** Leahy called the meeting to order at 7:09pm.

**Commissioners Present:** **Chair** Leahy, Dr. Scott, Williams, Finch

**Commissioners Absent:** **Vice Chair** Collins

**Staff Present:** Dr. Sally Nash, J. Tower- Chief, Historic Preservation, Jacqui Rouse, Joel Braithwaite-Assistant City Attorney

**Others Present:** Sheryl Wood-Commission Counsel

**Chair** Leahy introduced the commissioners and staff. He stated the Commission's purpose pursuant to the authority of the land use articles and administered the oath en masse to all persons intending to testify at the hearing.

### C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### 1. June 24, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Dr. Scott moved approval of the June 24, 2021 meeting minutes as written. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 4-0.

### D. OLD BUSINESS

#### 1. 65 East Street – T. Averill Architect LLC – Construct rear deck and install wrought iron fence. (HPC2021-109)

Mr. Averill and Mr. Tower had no additional comments.

Dr. Scott noted that whereas the application for 65 East Street complies with guidelines C.1, C.6, C.9, D.1 (SOI-1, 2, & 5) and E.1, moved conditional approval as noted in the staff report dated July 6, 2021. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 4-0.

### G. PRE APPLICATION

**Chair** Leahy reminded those present that this pre application discussion is an informal discussion held as a courtesy to the applicants to determine feasibility as well as to address any other issues of concern that may arise at the hearing. This review does not constitute an approval and nothing discussed in this session will be binding on the commissioners or applicants. The applicants acknowledged that this is a pre application discussion and nothing discussed would be binding on the applicants or the HPC. The Applicants of the following pre-applications acknowledged the statement.

**1. 61 Franklin Street** – Maria Groben, Purple Cherry Architects – Replace existing carport with new garage.

Ms. Groben noted that the presentation addresses three points, the transoms, a section of the street, and materials. She noted that the revised proposal calls to remove the transoms. She further noted that the HPC requested the neighboring context of the scale of the garage so provided a brief discussion on the cross-section and the section across Dean Street. She noted that the review resulted in no changes to the height because it is in keeping with the neighborhood. She noted that the Applicant asked that they submit the application using the cedar shingle material. There were other minor changes such as removing the windows and replaced with doors.

Mr. Tower measured the cornice height of the block and no cornice height is higher than 10-feet but the proposed cornice is over 12-feet so the HPC should consider the height. He noted that the mass of the building and the way it presents itself on the streetscape is large and out of scale with the adjacent building.

**Chair Leahy summarized** that in the opinion of the majority of the commissioners and staff, the design still needs work to be compliant with guidelines B.2 that relate to new building design, B.3 that relate to building height and bulk, and B.13 that relate to new garages. The issues that still need addressing include simplifying the detail trim, addressing the cornice height and the height of the first floor that causes the building to be out of scale compared to the main house and other structures on Dean Street. There are no issues regarding guidelines D.2 that relate to demolition, D.32 that relate to lighting and C.1 that relate to landscape designs adjacent to the garage. The applicant should also discuss zoning issues that may affect the design with City staff.

Mr. Kuchta discussed the proposal to reduce the landscape coverage around the existing pool. The proposal will introduce a single gate for security and create a walkway for trash storage. He went over the proposed materials for the lawn to include limestone and stone. He further went over the proposal for a new retaining wall with modifications.

**Chair Leahy summarized** that the Applicant needs to focus on the area that is in the application.

**2. St. John's College/Mellon Hall** – Landscaping

Mr. Reineking introduced Mr. Vergason and noted that the hope was to have some updated materials for the building to present to the HPC but was unable to provide that information so nothing new on the building during this pre application.

Mr. Vergason discussed the three primary items of focus to include visibility of curtain wall at eastern edge, further discussion about materials, and comfort in the third of the three plans shared with a deeper terrace. He referred the HPC to the views shown previously and the proposed modifications of Option A and Option B along with the proposed materials. He discussed that the two railings options would be black and tubular so asked the HPC if there is a preference. He discussed the proposed option for the bench.

Mr. Tower noted that proposal respects guideline C.2 preservation that relate to topographic features and C.11 that relate to paving materials because of the proposed brick for the building.

**Chair Leahy summarized** that the Commissioners and Staff finds that the design presented is **feasible** as it relates to guidelines B.6 that relate to site and massing of additions (the design is subordinate and respects the existing historic structure). It is also compliant with the landscape design guidelines C.1 that relate to design and materials, C.2 that relate to topographic features, and C.11 that relate to paving materials. The construction process will lead to a need for archaeology monitoring in accordance to guideline E.1.

**3. 199 Duke of Gloucester Street/St. Anne's Parish – Michael Dowling – Gas Meter Relocation and Screening.**

Mr. Dowling went over the gas meter relocation at St. Anne's Church noting that BGE has been doing work on Church Circle. He noted that with the new BGE guidelines regarding new gas meter service they are no longer allowing gas meters inside the building. He discussed the current location of the gas meter inside the building and the proposed location in the same location but on the outside wall. He went over the diagram of the proposed gas meter. There is a required workspace that must remain clear in front of the meter so will eliminate landscaping to screen the building. He discussed two alternatives to paint to match to the existing brick and to provide removable painted screen.

**Chair Leahy summarized** that the concept and location for the proposed design is largely **feasible** with guideline D.29 but the Commissioners voiced concerns that the design needed more substance and additional screening on the two sides to respect the historic nature of the St. Anne's Church building. (See SOI Standard #9 – alterations shall be compatible to protect historic integrity.)

**4. Hillman Garage Replacement Project – Annapolis Mobility and Resilience Partners.**

Ms. Fogarty explained that late in June 2021, the feasibility analysis that reviewed the parking data and revenues was completed and indicated the project is feasible. She explained that the team is moving forward rapidly with the entitlements for the project and have site design approval. The team continues broad community outreach so there has been multi-faceted outreach and community engagement with 16 work sessions so are now starting some stakeholders meetings.

Mr. Dueland met with the PC to continue to develop the design over the past months.

Mr. Turner thanked staff for their time on this project. He explained that the height remains at 30-feet above sea level and elevation of 68-feet at Duke of Gloucester. He walked the HPC around the garage discussing the proposed improvements. He discussed the design change of moving the two stair towers to Gorman Street in the northeast and northwest corners for better pedestrian traffic movement. There will be a wider sidewalk to allow for four trees that is part of the stormwater management system. The proposal calls to maintain the walkway around the building but to widen it. He noted that the building would have a smaller footprint, the top level will not need pole lighting because of the solar canopy, and these panels would provide shading. He discussed the new entrance from Duke of Gloucester that will be slightly higher than the existing. He discussed the trees and the pop up festival proposed for the ground level. He showed the views of the garage from different locations in the City. He discussed the exterior garage design.

The Applicant's team responded to questions from the HPC.

Mr. Tower noted that changing the material at the top of the stair tower is an improved design and breaks up the mass.

**Chair Leahy summarized** that the Commissioners and Staff consider the design presented to be **feasible** with guidelines that relate to breaking up the mass of a very large structure. Guideline B.3 that relate to building height and bulk as well as code section 21.56.210, the change in materials and added setback accomplish the objective of these guidelines. The materials used are compliant with Guidelines D.28c. There are still concern about the views of the structure from other streets (Main) and from the State House Porch and State Circle so the HPC requested additional mockups with these views. More detail on landscape design is expected. There was considerable discussion on the design of the solar panels and screening on the roof. At this time, it is unclear if the panels will create a jagged profile. The HPC requested additional detail to determine compliance with Guidelines B.1 that relate to visual relationship of old and new, B.8 that relate to roof shapes and D.29 that relate to Utilities. The HPC requested additional design details for the proposed lighting on the roof to determine compliance with

guidelines B.2 that relate to compatibility and D.30 that relate to exterior lighting. Archaeology monitoring in accordance with guideline E.1 is expected.

#### **H. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

**Chair** Leahy thanked Dr. Scott for getting the photograph for Ms. Laynor.

**Chair** Leahy noted that the City Council plans to extend outdoor dining to November 1, 2021. They are working to color code the barricades. Mr. Tower noted that the HPC is going to have to take up the issue of umbrellas at some point.

**Chair** Leahy circulated his response to the Environmental Commission on the St. Mary's living shoreline. He will be proposing to form a workgroup and the workgroup will focus on the Weather Together plan to establish goals working with the AEC. He asked for volunteers and Ms. Finch volunteered to participate on the work group,

Mr. Tower noted that in terms of exterior utilities, the guidelines does not address the necessity of screening the gas meters if they are on the outside of the building so may need to change the guidelines.

#### **J. ADJOURNMENT**

With there being no further business, Dr. Scott moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:30pm. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

**The next meeting is September 14, 2021.**

Tami Hook, Recorder